

**Remarks**

The Office Action and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed. The following remarks herein are considered to be responsive thereto. Claims 1-2 and 5-10 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 2 are presently amended by this amendment.

**Rejections as to Form**

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that claim 2 as previously recited was unclear.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, claim 2 has been amended. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection.

**Rejections as to Substance**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,923,365 issued to Tamir, et al. (Tamir) in view of US Patent No. 6,366,296 issued to Boreczky, et al. (Boreczky).

In response to the above-mentioned comment and the current rejections, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 2. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references and is allowable and that Claims 2 and 5-10 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim.

In particular, Claim 1 of the present invention is being amended for clarification purposes to more accurately and definitively set forth the invention. The claim has been amended to set forth in regard to Claim 1 that the present invention comprises a method for accessing video content that uses the trajectories of objects by using the locations along said trajectories to access a desired scene contained in the video contents.

The patent to Tamir is directed a sports event video manipulating system. The system comprises a video field grabber that is operative to grab a video field and an A/D converter to digitize the grabbed video field. Further, the system comprises an object tracker that tracks an object through a plurality of successive video fields.

Tamir further discloses the tracking and highlighting of objects selected on a first frame of a segment throughout a sequence of frames composing an event until the objects get out of the camera field of view. Further, a past trajectory of the objects may be superimposed on a video. (as shown in Figure 6B and described in Tamir at col. 8, lines 5-10). The primary objective of Tamir is to “grab” and digitize a particular frame video frame, thereafter identifying an object that is featured within the frame. A system operator marks objects on the first frame of the video stream. Video frame pixels data is then DMAed by means of a fast video bus into the image analyzer and a dedicated circuit to estimate the motion and to track the marked objects of interest and to estimate the motion of background windows at video rate.

A graphical object enhancement overlay is then created and stored on a hard disk memory. When the operator wishes to record the sequence on a VCR the frames are decoded and the corresponding graphical overlays are superimposed on each frame. Col. 8, lines 19-35.

The patent to Boreczky discloses a method and apparatus that is used for reviewing media files. The patent discloses a media browser that uses media feature information as an aid in navigating, selecting, editing, and/or annotating media files.

In regard to Claims 1 and 10, the presently claimed invention is directed a video contents access method that uses trajectories of objects to access a desired scene contained in the contents of a video. The trajectory of an object situated within a scene is displayed and summarily used as an indicator of the status of a displayed video object. The displayed trajectory is used as an interface for a system user to access images of the object at a desired time frame in addition to images of the object at a predetermined time that succeeds the desired time frame.

By selecting a point upon the displayed trajectory, the system user "jumps" from the designated point on the trajectory to a video frame that corresponds to the point on the trajectory. Further, a system user may "move" along the displayed trajectory to access and replay the video frames that correspond to the objects position at the points moved along the displayed trajectory. Therefore, the present invention not only serves to display a trajectory of an object, but also serves as a user interface that allows access to specific time points within a video.

In this instance, the distinctive difference between the presently claimed invention and the Tamir invention is in the use of the trajectory information to access video frames. In the present invention, to "access" video means to jump to the particular time point of the video and replaying the successive video frames from the accessed time point forward. *See* specification, pg. 13, lines 28-32.

As mentioned above, in the present invention the user selects a point of the trajectory in which to access the specific time-point of the video. Therefore, the

trajectory information is treated as a user interface for accessing the specific time point of the video, not only just displaying the locus of an object's movement.

Conversely, Tamir's system limits the use of the trajectory information for display purposes only, and not as a means for accessing a desired scene of the video contents as claimed in the present invention. That is, nowhere in Tamir is it disclosed that a displayed trajectory is implemented as a user interface, or using the trajectory interface to select a point on the trajectory for specifying the time point of a video and replaying the video from the specified time point.

Thus, Tamir is limited in scope to the tracking and highlighting of objects and further displaying a trajectory of the object and cannot be extended to using the trajectory of an object to access a desired scene contained within video contents as defined by claims 1 and 10. The teaching of Tamir is distinct from that of the presently claimed invention, and further, provides no suggestion that it may be modified to obtain the system of the present invention as claimed. Hence, there would appear to be no basis for the comparison of Tamir with the Applicants' presently claimed invention.

Further, the combination of Tamir and Boreczky does not teach all of the elements of the presently claimed invention. Boreczky, as cited, does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Tamir.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 10 are allowable for at least the given reasons. Further, Claims 2 and 5-9, which depend from Claim 1, are allowable therewith at least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman  
Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
SF:WAP:jf